



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/065,749

11/15/2002

Sankar Narayana Kondur

001-035

7525

29569

7590

08/26/2008

FURR LAW FIRM
2622 DEBOLT ROAD
UTICA, OH 43080

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2191

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/065,749	Applicant(s) KONDUR, SANKAR NARAYANA	
	Examiner SATISH S. RAMPURIA	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 05/27/2008.
2. The objection to specification is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. The objection to claim 30 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 to claims 26-37 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
5. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph to claims 30 and 36 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
6. Claims cancelled by the Applicant: 1-37.
7. New claims added by the Applicant: 38-46.
8. Claims 38-46 are pending.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant has not submitted any arguments in response to the Non-Final Office Action. Applicant should submit an argument and must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them and pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions.

Claim Objections

10. Claim 38 objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 9 of the claim, it appears to be a type for the word "afunctionality" it should have been "a functionality".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 39-46 recites the limitation "A system". However, independent claim 38 is a process (i.e., method) claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 38-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2003/0192029 to Hughes (hereinafter, Hughes) in view of US Publication No. 2003/0041313 to Harmon (hereinafter, Harmon).

Per claim 38:

Hughes discloses:

38. (new) A process for software development comprising:

having a software development workstation with internal local cache memory (Fig. 1 and paragraph [0032] "...software development system... client 108, 108', 108"...") and network interface that interfaces the workstation to a number of other workstations (Fig. 1 and paragraph [0035] "...communication network 112"),

external storage (paragraph [0036] "servers 104... have sufficient memory, data storage...") with a datasource manager managing the data (paragraph [0127] "the component catalog 804... stored...storage device (e.g., database server)"),

a client side component (paragraph [0032] "at least one client 108, 108', 108", generally 108" and FIG. 1);

a client system connecting to a server system (See FIG. 1 and related discussion) and a plurality of server side components (paragraph [0036] "multiple servers 104... application software... implemented in components...")

where said managing function includes one or more of a group of adding/deleting accounts, adding/deleting users to accounts, modifying the user information and maintaining the account and user directories, adding projects, deleting projects, adding directories, deleting directories, adding files, and deleting files (paragraph [0117] "the requirements design subsystem 816 enables the product manager 204 and the architect 208 to create, edit (Note: i.e., adding/deleting), download, upload, and/or approve requirements in the specification"),

where the server side components includes an Account and Users manager (paragraph [0007] "...a product manager..."), a Project manager (FIG. 2, element 208), a Source

Art Unit: 2191

code compilation and run-time management (paragraph [0121] “a component development environment (CDE) 832”), a Repository Manager (paragraph [0126] “the scoring module 908... evaluate multiple software designs...”), a Datasource Manager (paragraph [0114] “The component catalog 804 stores components”), a functionality Center (paragraph [0071] “primary architecture review board member 308 tests the functionality of the component”), a Requirements and Analysis center (paragraph [0122] “the QA application 836 executes test cases developed by the QA developer”), where Account and Users manager (paragraph [0007] “...a product manager...”), a Project manager (FIG. 2, element 208) are core components that are required by other components to access the resources required (paragraph [0007] “The product manager receives... submissions... to the communicated specification.... Each submission is scored, at least in part based on the degree to which the submission satisfies the communicated specification...”).

Hughes does not explicitly disclose a DrawBoard, and a Productivity Wizard, where Account and Users manager, a Project manager are core components that are required by other components to access the resources required, where users use said DrawBoard to draw the screens of the application and where users can use said Productivity Wizards to create parts of their application in an easy way.

However, Harmon discloses in an analogous computer system a DrawBoard (paragraph [0031] “screen...displayed... graphical user interface”), and a Productivity Wizard (paragraph [0031] “data collector wizard”), where users use said DrawBoard to

Art Unit: 2191

draw the screens (paragraph [0031] “screen...displayed... graphical user interface”) of the application and where users can use said Productivity Wizards (paragraph [0031] “data collector wizard”) to create parts of their application in an easy way (paragraph [0075] “Developers create designs or components in response to the specification”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of including a DrawBoard, and a Productivity Wizard, where Account and Users manager, a Project manager are core components that are required by other components to access the resources required, where users use said DrawBoard to draw the screens of the application and where users can use said Productivity Wizards to create parts of their application in an easy way as taught by Harmon in the method of software development as taught by Hughes. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have a DrawBoard, and a Productivity Wizard, where Account and Users manager, a Project manager are core components that are required by other components to access the resources required, where users use said DrawBoard to draw the screens of the application and where users can use said Productivity Wizards to create parts of their application in an easy way to provide user interface tool which not only provide height level guidance with respect to configuration options, but which further inform the operator that further configuration is available and provides simplified access to more detailed configuration options (paragraph [0006]).

Per claim 39 (new):

Art Unit: 2191

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 26 in which said Account and Users manager manages a group of users the functionality related to said groups and users (FIG. 2, paragraph [0040] "...The product manager 202 is the manager for the development and deployment of a component...").

Per claim 40 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which said Project manager manages Projects, their components and their related functionality (paragraph [0047] "product manager 302 moderates a development team 300, which is formed from an distributed group of developers (used here to include designers, design reviewers, developers, development reviewers, etc.)").

Per claim 41 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which said Source code compilation and run-time management manages the source code, its compilation and running (paragraph [0042] "QA developer 216 develops the test plan using the requirements specification written by the product manager 202" and paragraph [0121] "a component development environment (CDE) 832").

Per claim 42 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which said Datasource Manager manages the databases, database accounts, and other databases related functionality for the users (paragraph [0047] “product manager 302 moderates a development team 300, which is formed from an distributed group of developers (used here to include designers, design reviewers, developers, development reviewers, etc.)”).

Per claim 43 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which said functionality Center manages the Webservices related functionality for the user (paragraph [0126] “FIG. 9, the development posting subsystem 820 includes a web server 902”).

Per claim 44 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which said Requirements and Analysis center provides the Requirements and Analysis functionality for a project (paragraph [0041] “An architect (also referred to as a “designer”) 208 designs the software component. The architect 208 preferably is a senior developer who acts as a mentor to and

Art Unit: 2191

collaborates with one or more of the other team members 204, 212, 216 to design the architecture of the component” and paragraph [0122] “the QA application 836 executes test cases developed by the QA developer”).

Per claim 45 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes does not explicitly disclose in which said Productivity Wizards is a collection of components.

However, Harmon discloses in an analogous computer system in which said Productivity Wizards is a collection of components (paragraph [0039] “FIG. 2, a high level diagram of a user interface tool...data collector wizard...welcome screen 201, component selection screens 202, and customization option screen 203...communication with customization tool 250”).

The feature of providing in which said Productivity Wizards is a collection of components would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Per claim 46 (new):

The rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further, Hughes discloses:

A system according to claim 38 in which the client side connects to the server system using a LAN (paragraph [0035] “The communication... LAN or WAN...”).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wei Y. Zhen** can be reached on **(571) 272-3708**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191